



A VICTORY AT CAMBRIDGE.

Yale Wins a Second Time From Harvard—A Great Contest at Sanders' Theater.

Cambridge, Mass., March 27.—The annual debate between Yale and Harvard was held in Sanders' Theater last evening and Yale was awarded the decision. Not content with the victory in New Haven a year ago, Yale carried the campaign into "the enemy's country," and defeated her rival, heretofore invincible on the home platform. If there existed any doubt of the genuineness of the debating renaissance in New Haven, that doubt must have been dissipated by last evening's contest. The former success might have been explained, as indeed it was explained by many here, as a chance victory. An unusually strong Yale team met a team not up to the previous Harvard standard, and, under the stimulus of a sympathetic home audience, succeeded in interrupting the chain of Harvard victories. But the outcome of last evening's contest cannot be thus easily explained away. Harvard was awake to the situation and the favorable conditions were hers. Both universities had picked their teams carefully, the one bent on re-establishing its former prestige, the other on vindicating the verdict of a year ago.

A propitious evening rewarded those who had conducted the arrangements, and a crowded auditorium awaited the rival teams. At previous debates in Sanders' Theater the audience has never more than comfortably filled the lower part of the house. On this occasion every seat in the theater was disposed of, and one hundred and fifty admission tickets were sold at the entrance. If, as seems probable, the interest in these debates is to continue, a serious problem must be met on the alternate years, when the contest is held in Harvard territory. Memorial Hall was erected before intercollegiate debates were contemplated, and the college theater, which is adequate for most purposes, will no longer contain the numbers who wish to listen to these intellectual battles. Either the attendance will have to be restricted by an undesirable selection, or a Boston auditorium will have to be secured at a sacrifice to the distinctively university character which has been the charm of these meetings.

Last evening, for the first time in a Cambridge debate, the Yale men occupied seats together. Many of the Boston graduates who had hoped to be present were unable to do so, but the Yale colony in the Law School, the undergraduates who came from New Haven and the friends of the visiting debaters formed an enthusiastic minority, animated by the common sentiment of unalterable opposition to the adoption by the United States of a policy of gold monometallism.

In front of the Yale seats was a delegation from Radcliffe College. Seats had also been reserved near the stage for the members of the University crew, who entered together, and were given an ovation.

The question to be debated was:

"Resolved, That the United States should adopt definitively the single gold standard and should decline to enter a bimetallic league even if Great Britain,

France and Germany should be willing to enter such a league."

The judges were Judge Edgar A. Aldrich of the United States Circuit Court, Prof. Davis R. Dewey of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Prof. Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia.

The entrance of the speakers accompanied by Governor Wolcott, who was to preside, was the signal for a hearty round of applause, and throughout the evening the good points made by the rival contestants were received with impartial courtesy.

In opening the exercises, Governor Wolcott referred to the friendly relations which made such contests between the universities possible and gave his warm endorsement to this avenue of intercollegiate rivalry. In this connection he said:

"We are so organized that there is intense enjoyment in the full and free exercise of any faculty, physical or mental. And this enjoyment takes on a keener zest when there enters into the exercises of these faculties the element of emulation, of the strong desire to excel. The two most famous universities of the Western Hemisphere stand for the same things—they stand, and shall always stand, for education, for enlightenment, and for manhood. And it is proper and fitting that the students of these two great universities should be knit together by something like the bond that forms two regiments enlisted in the same cause and fighting beneath the same flag.

"This tie of comradeship should not—and I need not say that it does not—preclude an intense rivalry and emulation. There is something fine on the field, on the track, or on the water, in feeling that a man not only represents himself, but that he bears the colors of his college to victory if may be, but if not, to honorable defeat.

"Surely there is also something fine when men meet in generous emulation, in which the fine instrument is the human brain, that embodies arguments and thoughts which are to find fitting expression in language that may take on the color and the wings of imagery or poetry. And so, gentlemen and ladies, it is a pleasure to me, representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to welcome to this debate the men who have done us the honor to come here from our sister University of Yale. Whatever rivalry, whatever emulation exists between these two universities, it should always be a generous, a knightly, a chivalric emulation and rivalry."

The Debate Analyzed.

The debate which followed, measured by the standard of an ideal debate, was unsatisfactory, for the two teams failed to meet squarely on the issue. But it would be a mistake to call it an uninteresting contest, for the high quality of the competition, particularly in argument, the dogged refusal of each side to be drawn into accepting the other's interpretation of the question, and the ingenuity displayed in devising pitfalls for an unwary opponent made the debate fully as exciting as any in which the two universities have engaged. The suspense, during the half-hour interval which elapsed while the judges were reaching a decision, was keen among the debaters and listeners. The greater part of the audience undoubtedly thought the home team had won. Fletcher Dobyns, the last speaker for Harvard, had thrown discredit on Yale's interpretation of the question, and his superiority in address and his tact in presenting his theme in a popular way had drawn most of the listeners into his way of thinking.

But the question was deeper than he represented it. Yale had maintained that the question was not a theoretical, academic one of the merits of monometallism and bimetalism, but a practical question of whether it was expedient to definitively adopt the single gold standard at the present time. Harvard had refused to recognize this interpretation. If it was tenable, the elaborately constructed argument of the affirmative was futile, for it failed wholly to meet the issue. The Yale contingent were confident that the logic of Yale's position would be recognized by the judges.

If, however, the Harvard interpretation obtained, the decision was not certain to be in Harvard's favor. Yale, while declining to elaborate any definite bimetallic policy, had shown the advantages which would accrue from a use of the two metals, and emphasized the faults and dangers of a single standard. Moreover, the Harvard debaters had at one time discussed the evils of the present attitude of the government, which would be corrected by definitively adopting the gold standard, and, subsequently, under the stress of the Yale attack had minimized these evils, asserting that the United States was already pursuing a policy to gold monometallism and that the proposed step would merely operate to confirm this attitude—an apparent inconsistency of which the negative took full advantage. It is probable, however, that the judges decided the debate on Yale's interpretation of the question, and that, had they allowed Harvard's contention, they would have considered the absence of a constructive argument for bimetalism a fatal defect in Yale's presentation.

WRIGHTINGTON OPENS FOR HARVARD.

The debate was opened by Sidney R. Wrightington, of Massachusetts, on whom the task devolved of outlining the affirmative argument.

He won the attention of the audience by his finished and convincing delivery, showing a marked improvement over his work in the trial competition. At the outset he stated the question to be "Shall we strengthen our existing gold standard by adopting it definitively, or shall we attempt to establish a double standard by a national agreement?" He then presented a historic argument to show that old basic principle of monetary evolution is movement away from the cheaper and bulkier standards to those containing greater value in smaller bulk. The present gold standard he held to be the survival of the fittest in the long process of selection. He advocated the expediency of a single standard as simple and automatic and derided any attempt to establish an artificial system by legislation.

The bimetallic theory he characterized as experimental and called on the negative to state at its earliest opportunity what ratio of exchange it would suggest for the two metals.

The existing gold standard he thought was good enough. Production, exports and wages had risen. The fall in price was not a menace but a stimulus to American enterprise. The past twenty-five years had been in the main a period of prosperity. Business troubles had been due rather to special causes than to the currency and the existing financial system had worked badly only when there had been talk of changing it. The adoption of the gold standard definitely would restore confidence in the business world.

YALE "LAY LOW."

By this opening argument it was apparent that Harvard expected Yale to champion bimetalism. Had the visitors taken up the gauntlet thrown down by Wrightington and suggested a rate on which the two metals were to be maintained at a parity, there is no telling what pitfalls were in store for them. But this was no part of the Yale program. Neither was it a part of the program of the Yale team to show its hand too quickly. Charles S. Macfarland of Massachusetts, in opening the

negative side, played the part of "Er'er Fox" on a celebrated occasion and "lay low" to allow Harvard to make a few more punches at the tar baby. He stated the position of the negative to be merely that the United States should not take action which would preclude union with other nations for relief from existing financial evils,—but he left it for his colleagues to elaborate this idea. He pointed out clearly the evils of the existing monetary system and the most apparent benefits which the establishment of international bimetalism would confer. He showed the continual unrest of the business world since gold became the monetary unit in 1873, and how it had destroyed the par of exchange between gold and silver using countries and the resulting damage to trade. He emphasized the effect of the marked fall in prices under the gold regime in discouraging business enterprise and forcing every man to seek immediate personal advantage and hasty profits with the inevitable result of idle money and idle men. In contrast he showed the conditions in France under bimetalism during 70 years.

His manner throughout was distinctly argumentative and his gestures were mainly those of emphasis.

HARVARD KEEPS ON THE SAME TACK.

G. Hamilton Dorr of New Jersey, took up the thread of the Harvard argument and in turn disposed of the leading arguments urged by bimetalism and silver advocates against the single standard. His address showed most thorough preparation, and, if the issue had been the relative merits of the single and double standard, it would have been most difficult to refute. In spite of a slight impediment of speech, Dorr could be heard easily in all parts of the theater. He began by answering the claim of the preceding speaker that falling prices had discouraged business enterprise and gave the familiar arguments to account for the decline by natural causes. Turning his attention to the argument of appreciated debts, he asserted that the debtor need work fewer hours to pay his debt now than when it was contracted for wages and incomes had risen and prices fallen.

Among the dangers of bimetalism he counted the rising prices which induced over speculation, and showed how the increase of money could be a hardship for the laborer owing to the rise in wages failing to keep pace with the rise in prices.

YALE ON THE OFFENSIVE.

With the principal argument for Harvard, two-thirds finished. Charles U. Clark of Brooklyn, N. Y., took up the Yale argument and defined the position of the negative with telling clearness. He spoke so low that his words could not be heard with distinctness in the rear of the theater, but this very fault in his delivery drew closer attention to him and he held the closest attention of the audience.

In answer to the previous speaker, he said that Yale men were not there to discuss the wages question. The question was whether the immediate adoption of the gold standard definitively was advisable. The only reasonable presumption was that the question applied to the present time, not to the indefinite future. The important question was not highest prices but steady prices. Prices had not been steady under the gold standard. Such a radical step as the adoption definitively of the single standard would further unsettle prices. It would be direct opposition to the established policy of this country which has always been the avowed friend of bimetalism. Instead of restoring confidence it would leave the single gold standard would require an immediate gold reserve of vast proportions or a provision for future gold. The former would require large issues of bonds and the doubling of the national debt. The latter would be a postponement merely of the evil and the